



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,411	01/16/2002	Michael K. Larkin	SJO920010010US1	6117

45216 7590 07/07/2005

KUNZLER & ASSOCIATES  
8 EAST BROADWAY  
SUITE 600  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

AVELLINO, JOSEPH E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/050,411	LARKIN, MICHAEL K.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Joseph E. Avellino	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-17,19-21,23-28 and 30-36 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-17,19-21,24-28,30,31 and 33-36 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 23 and 32 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

RD

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-21, 23-28, and 30-36 are presented for examination; claims 1, 8, 15, and 26 independent. The Office acknowledges the cancellation of claims 3, 18, 22, 29 and the addition of claims 33-36.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. Claims 23 and 32 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth below in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Specification***

3. The amendment filed June 9, 2005 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

*p. 11, paragraph starting on line 24:* the agent 200 comprises a user interface module 203, a client selection module 205, and a job relocation module 219.

*p. 12, paragraph starting on line 1:* the client comprises a job execution module 221 and that the client 202 may be coupled to stub software module 229.

*p. 13, paragraph starting on line 24:* the client module comprises a job execution module 221 which may determine which type of job execution queue might be used to process a particular user request.

*Figure 2:* the user interface module 203, the Client Selection Module 205, and the Job Execution Module 221 are supported only by the new matter objected to, and therefore must be cancelled.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

4. The title of the invention is still not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Intelligent system control agent for managing jobs on a network by managing a plurality of queues on a client.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22, 24, 26-31, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doraswamy et al. (USPN 6,128,642) (hereinafter Doraswamy) in view of Willke (USPN 6,813,767).

6. Referring to claim 1, Doraswamy discloses an intelligent system control agent (i.e. local processor station) for coordinating user requested jobs among a plurality of clients (i.e. remote processor stations), comprising:

a user interface (i.e. input device such as a keyboard) configured to receive user requests (col. 4, lines 25-35);

a client selection module configured to select one of a plurality of clients to service a user request according to a predetermined criterion, the clients comprising at least one queue, each having an individual scheme for prioritizing jobs (e.g. abstract; col. 9, lines 11-18; col. 9, lines 55-61); and

a communication module configured to submit the user request to the selected client (col. 9, line 61 to col. 10, line 8).

Doraswamy does not specifically disclose the client comprising a plurality of queue types, only at least one queue (see above). In analogous art, Willke discloses another intelligent system control agent wherein the client has a plurality of queue types, each queue type having an individual scheme for prioritizing jobs (i.e. it is inherent that a queue has a scheme for prioritizing jobs since a queue inherently prioritizes jobs by the order in which they arrive (i.e. priority queue and normal queue) (Figure 3, ref. 312, 314). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Willke with Doraswamy. The processing engines of Doraswamy would be able to utilize the technique of Willke

Art Unit: 2143

to handle transaction requests having different request characteristics as supported by Willke (col. 1, lines 32-33).

7. Referring to claim 2, Doraswamy furthermore discloses a system health check configured to maintain an awareness (i.e. status announcements) of the state of the selected client (col. 4, line 57 to col. 5, line 10).

8. Referring to claim 4, Doraswamy furthermore discloses an agent endpoint module configured to enable the relocation (the Office takes the term "relocation" to be broadly construed as "shifting the process to another agent") of the system control agent (the disclosure of Doraswamy states that although the method as performed by a single local processor station, each processor station in the network also can perform the same method from its own local perspective, see col. 4, line 59-57).

9. Referring to claim 5, Doraswamy discloses a federation module configured to allow cross-communication and interaction between a plurality of system control agents (i.e. processor stations) (col. 4, line 57 to col. 5, line 10).

10. Referring to claim 6, Doraswamy discloses a job relocation module configured to relocate a user requested job from one client to another (i.e. from the local processing station to a remote processing station) (col. 4, line 57 to col. 5, line 10; col. 9, lines 21-31).

11. Referring to claim 7, Doraswamy discloses a state storage module configured to store the state of jobs being relocated from one client to another (Doraswamy states that the state information is transferred from the local processor station to the remote processor station, col. 9, line 61 to col. 10, line 8, which can only occur if it was stored at the local processor station, thereby inherently providing that there must be a state storage module configured to store the state of jobs being relocated from one client to another).

12. Claims 8, 14-17, 19-21, 24, 26-28, 30-31 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

13. Referring to claim 9, Doraswamy discloses the invention substantively as disclosed in claim 8. Doraswamy does not specifically disclose selecting a suitable queue for each request sent to the client. In analogous art, Willke discloses another system which determines a suitable queue for each request sent to the client (Figure 3, ref. 320). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Willke with Doraswamy. The processing engines of Doraswamy would be able to utilize the technique of Willke to handle transaction requests having different request characteristics as supported by Willke (col. 1, lines 32-33).

Art Unit: 2143

14. Referring to claim 10, Doraswamy in view of Willke disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 9. Doraswamy in view of Willke do not specifically state comprising an asynchronous queue to run requests simultaneously within a specified client, however it is well known that modern operating systems are multitasking operating systems, able to run a plurality of jobs in parallel via time slicing or parallel processing. By this rationale "Official Notice" is taken that both the concepts and advantages of providing for an asynchronous queue configured to run requests simultaneously within a specified client are well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Doraswamy and Willke with an asynchronous queue in order to quickly complete tasks which do not require exclusivity between the threads, such as write locks or critical code sections, thereby increasing the throughput of the system and reducing overall system overhead.

15. Referring to claim 11, Doraswamy in view of Willke disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 9. Doraswamy in view of Willke do not specifically state comprising a synchronous queue configured to run requests in the order the requests were received by a specified client, however it is well known that FIFO (First-In-First-Out) queues allow requests to run in order they are received. By this rationale "Official Notice" is taken that both the concepts and advantages of providing for a synchronous queue configured to run requests in the order the requests are received is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Doraswamy and Willke to provide order to the



requests, and ensuring that the oldest request is handled first, thereby providing that no job is starved for service, which thereby increases throughput and reducing overall system overhead.

16. Referring to claim 12, Doraswamy in view of Willke disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 9. Doraswamy in view of Willke do not specifically state comprising an exclusive queue to run requests exclusive of any other requests in any other queue on the system, however it is well known that exclusive queues exists, which provide for locking mechanisms of critical code or write operations which will become corrupted if not run atomically (which is the term in the art for running a task or thread without interruption). By this rationale, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concepts and advantages of providing for an exclusive queue to run requests exclusive of any other requests in any other queue on the system is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide for an exclusive queue to run requests exclusive of any other requests in any other queue on the system to ensure that operations requiring access to critical sections of code are not corrupted by other jobs and also for providing exclusive access to operations which would corrupt data if executed in a racing condition with other threads, thereby providing data reliability, ensuring required operations are completed and reducing overall system downtime due to data corruption.

17. Regarding claims 33-36, Doraswamy in view of Willke disclose the invention substantively as described above. Doraswamy in view of Willke do not specifically disclose each client has at least three queue types, rather Willke discloses a normal queue and a priority queue, however it is well known in process and packet scheduling arts that any number of queues can be utilized, each with its own priority (i.e. highest, high, and normal). By this rationale, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for three or more queues is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Willke to utilize three queues instead of two queues in order to further classify requests into a more detailed queue reserving the highest priority queue for the utmost important requests, thereby reducing system overhead as well as increasing throughput of the system.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doraswamy in view of Willke as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Stamm et al. (USPN 6,711,616) (hereinafter Stamm).

18. Doraswamy in view of Willke disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 8. Doraswamy in view of Willke do not specifically disclose stub software to control execution of a request residing on a specified client. In analogous art, Stamm discloses another method of controlling a client which includes stub software to control execution of a request residing on a specified client (i.e. monitoring software) (col. 3,

Art Unit: 2143

line 57 to col. 4, line 4). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Stamm with Doraswamy and Willke in order to more efficiently offload tasks from strained machines to idle machines, thereby improving performance and throughput.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doraswamy in view of Willke as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Cajolet (USPN 6,192,388).

19. Doraswamy in view of Willke disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 24. Doraswamy in view of Willke do not specifically state transferring a request by sending requests to state storage system by a client, sending instructions to a new client to access requests, accessing requests from the state storage by the new client, and relocating the request to the new client station. In analogous art, Cajolet discloses another system control agent which transfers a request by instructing a client to relocate a current requests by a system administrator (i.e. a local user); sending requests to a state storage system (i.e. dispatcher) by a client; sending instructions to a new client to access requests from the state storage system by the agent; accessing requests from the state storage system by the new client; and relocating the requests to the new client station (col. 9, lines 15-30). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cajolet with Dorasamy and Willke in order to quickly execute complex computational tasks using only those

computers that are available and have the appropriate capabilities to execute the task as supported by Cajolet (e.g. abstract).

### ***Response to Arguments***

20. Applicant's arguments filed June 9, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

21. In the remarks, Applicant argues, in substance, that (1) Willke teaches away from queues distributed among a plurality of clients, (2) Stamm teaches away from submitting the user request to the selected client since the client requests tasks from a server.

22. As to point (1) the Office is not relying upon Willke to teach the feature of queues distributed among a plurality of clients. Applicant will notice that Doraswamy discloses queues distributed among a plurality of clients (see rejection above). By this rationale, the rejection is maintained.

23. As to point (2) the Office is not relying upon Stamm to teach the feature of submitting the user request to the selected client. Applicant will notice that Doraswamy discloses submitting the user request to the selected client (see rejection above). Furthermore the concept of automatically sending user requests to the selected client is well known in the art (see Doraswamy) and would just be an obvious design choice

Art Unit: 2143

whether to have the client request tasks to execute or for the server to automatically push tasks to the client. By this rationale, the rejection is maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


25. Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JEA  
June 15, 2005



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100